UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,059	05/08/2007	James Kowalski	33554A	3254
1095 NOVARTIS	7590 05/08/200	EXAMINER		
CORPORATE ONE HEALTH	INTELLECTUAL PRO	YU, HONG		
	ER, NJ 07936-1080		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4131	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/586,059	KOWALSKI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	HONG YU	4131
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	
Disposition of Claims		
4)	wn from consideration.	equirement.
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and all accomposed and all all all all all all all all all al	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte

Application/Control Number: 10/586,059 Page 2

Art Unit: 4131

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the claims/priority

Claims 1-23, 25-36, 38-49, and 52-55 are pending, claims 24, 37, 50, and 51 are canceled in this application. This application is a national stage entry of PCT/EP05/0040, filled on 01/17/2005.

Restriction

- 1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.
- 2. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.
- 3. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-23, 25-33, 38-49, 52-55, drawn to compositions comprising DPP-IV.

Group II, claim(s) 34-36, drawn to process of making the composition comprising DPP_IV.

4. As set forth in Rule 13.1 of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions. Moreover, as stated in PCT Rule 13.2, the requirement of unity of invention referred to in PCT Rule 13.2 shall be fulfilled where a group of inventions is claimed in one and the same international application only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression special technical features shall mean those technical features

Art Unit: 4131

that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art, so linked, as to form a single general inventive concept. The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the *special technical feature* in all groups is pharmaceutical composition comprising DPP-IV. The element cannot be a *special technical feature* under PCT Rule 13.2 because the element is shown in prior art. Balkan et al. (US 2003/0139434 A1) teach compositions in form of compressed tablet (example 1) comprising the same DPP-IV (LAF237) (paragraph 47) and excipients (example 1). Consequently, pharmaceutical composition comprising DPP-IV is not linked by the same or a corresponding special feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Multiple inventors

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Rejoinder

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise

Art Unit: 4131

require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

<u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 4

7. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Species election

8. Upon the selection of the invention mentioned above, a species election is necessary if the selected invention is motioned below.

Art Unit: 4131

9. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Page 5

- 10. The species are as follows:
 - a. various compositions with various percentages for each component in claims 1-12, 34-36, and 47-49;
 - b. various weight of DPP-IV to weight of diluent ratios in claims 40 and 42;
 - c. various particle sizes and distributions in claims 17, 18, 19, 22, and 23;
 - d. various tablet thickness to tablet weight ratios in claims 16, 17, 18, and 21;
 - e. various H₂O content in claims 18 and 20;
 - f. various processes of preparing tablet in claims 34-36;
 - g. various format of dosage unit in claims 29-33, 52, and 53.
- 11. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the special technical feature in all groups is a composition comprising (i) DPP-IV inhibitor; (ii) diluent; (iii) disintegrant; (iv) lubricant. The prior art Balkan et al. teach compositions in form of compressed tablet (example 1) comprising the same DPP-IV (LAF237) (paragraph 47) and excipients (example 1). Theses elements cannot be a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2 because the elements are shown in the prior art.
- 12. There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of

Art Unit: 4131

search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Page 6

- 13. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:
 - a. elect a single composition with a single percentage for each ingredient in claims 1-12, 34-36, and 47-49;
 - b. elect a single weight of DPP-IV to weight of diluent ratio in claims 40 and42;
 - c. elect a single particle sizes and distributions in claims 17, 18, 19, 22, and 23;
 - d. elect a single tablet thickness to tablet weight ratio in claims 16, 17, 18, and 21;
 - e. elect a single H₂O content in claims 18 and 20;
 - f. elect a single process in claims 34-36;
 - g. elect a single format of dosage unit in claims 29-33, 52, and 53.
- 14. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Application/Control Number: 10/586,059 Page 7

Art Unit: 4131

14. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

- 15. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).
- 16. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.
- 17. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Correspondence

Art Unit: 4131

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 8

examiner should be directed to HONG YU whose telephone number is (571)270-1328.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:20 am-6:50 pm.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patrick Nolan can be reached on 571-272-0847. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HY

/Patrick J. Nolan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4131